



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/602,142

06/20/2003

Jean-Pierre Sommadossi

11874-044-999

8280

20583

7590

12/10/2008

JONES DAY
222 EAST 41ST ST
NEW YORK, NY 10017

EXAMINER

MCINTOSH III, TRAVISS C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1623

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/10/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/602,142	Applicant(s) SOMMADOSSI ET AL.	
	Examiner TRAVISS C. MCINTOSH III	Art Unit 1623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 89, 130-141, 143-158 and 160-187 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 89, 130-141, 143-158, 160-187 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1623

DETAILED ACTION

The Amendment filed 7/25/2008 has been received, entered into the record, and carefully considered. The following information provided in the amendment affects the instant application by:

No claims have been amended.

No claims have been added.

Claims 1-88, 90-129, 142, 159, and 188-194 have been canceled.

Remarks drawn to rejections of Office Action mailed 2/26/08 include:

Double Patenting Rejections: which have been maintained for reasons of record over US 7,163,929 and withdrawn over application number 11/005,472. See below for further explanation.

Claim Objections: which have been overcome by applicant's canceling the claims.

An action on the merits of claims 89, 130-141, 143-158, and 160-187 is contained herein below. The text of those sections of Title 35, US Code which are not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined

Art Unit: 1623

application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

The rejection of 89, 130-141, 143-158, and 160-187 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-31 of U.S. Patent No. 7,163,929 is maintained for reasons of record. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both applications claim methods of treating viral infections using pyrrolopyrimidine nucleosides, and alternately in combination with the same additional anti-viral agents. It is noted that the '929 patent is drawn to treating flavivirus or pestivirus infections and the instant application is drawn to treating HCV infections, however, the Flaviviridae family of viral infections is known to include flavivirus, pestivirus and HCV, as such, it would be obvious to treat various members of the Flaviviridae family of viruses with the same composition. The Flaviviridae virus family contains both flavivirus and HCV viruses, and it would be prima facie obvious to practice the invention of the '929 patent on another member of the Flaviviridae virus family, HCV. Although the viruses belonging to the different genera have different biological properties and do not show serological cross-reactivity, great similarity in terms of virion morphology, genome organization, and presumed replication

Art Unit: 1623

strategy have been noted. At the minimum, the examiner notes that it would be obvious to try a method of treating HCV in light of the references teaching to treat pestivirus and flavivirus infections with overlapping compounds. The Supreme Court in KSR noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit. The Court quoting *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988, 78 USPQ2d 1329, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2006), stated that “[R]ejections on obviousness cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.” KSR, 550 U.S. at ___, 82 USPQ2d at 1396. Exemplary rationales that may support a conclusion of obviousness include:

(E) “Obvious to try” – choosing from a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, with a reasonable expectation of success.

In the instant case, there are a finite number of genera within the Flaviviridae family, and a teaching that therapy against two of those members would afford the skilled artisan a reasonable expectation of success in practicing the instantly claimed method in light of that teaching.

The purpose of double patenting rejections is to prevent an unjustified extension of the term of a patent, however it is also appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA

Art Unit: 1623

1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969). As such, absent evidence to the contrary, the examiner believes the instant methods of treating HCV are obvious over the patent's claims to methods of treating flavivirus and pestivirus infections.

The terminal disclaimer filed on 7/25/2008 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of 7,163,929 has been reviewed and is DISAPPROVED for the following reasons:

The person who has signed the disclaimer has not stated the extent of his/her interest, or the business entity's interest, in the application/patent. See 37 CFR 1.321(b)(3).

It is noted that applicant's are encouraged to review the terminal disclaimer filed on 10/6/2006 in application number 10/602,691, wherein a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. If a terminal disclaimer is filed and it is stated that applicants are the assignees of less than the entire right, title, and interest, then applicants are not asserting that they have 100% and the terminal disclaimer is improper.

The provisional rejection of claims 89, 130-141, 143-158, and 160-187 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2-17 and 19-75 of copending Application No. 11/005,472 is withdrawn as the copending application has been abandoned.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TRAVISS C. MCINTOSH III whose telephone number is (571)272-0657. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shaojia A. Jiang can be reached on 571-272-0627. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Traviss C McIntosh III/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1623
December 6, 2008